

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
10 AT TACOMA

11 RANDY PEDERSEN,
12 Plaintiff,
13 v.
14 CHASE RIVELAND,
15 Defendant.

Case No. C05-5344RBL
REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION TO
DENY PLAINTIFF'S
I.F.P. APPLICATION

Noted for June 24, 2005

16 The court has reviewed petitioner's application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Doc. 1). The
17 court finds and recommends:

18 (1). Plaintiff is in state custody at the Special Commitment Center and in his application, plaintiff
19 indicates that he has a bi-weekly income of \$214.80

20 (2). The district court may permit indigent litigants to proceed *in forma pauperis* upon completion
21 of a proper affidavit of indigency. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). However, the court has broad discretion in
22 denying an application to proceed in forma pauperis. *Weller v. Dickson*, 314 F.2d 598 (9th Cir. 1963),
23 *cert. denied*, 375 U.S. 845 (1963). Several district courts have ruled that denial of *in forma pauperis*
24 status is not unreasonable when the plaintiff is able to pay the initial expenses required to commence a
25 lawsuit. *See Temple v. Ellerthorpe*, 586 F.Supp. 848 (D.R.I. 1984); *Braden v. Estelle*, 428 F.Supp. 595
26 (S.D.Tex. 1977); *U.S. ex rel. Irons v. Com. of Pa.*, 407 F.Supp. 746 (M.D.Pa. 1976); *Shimabuku v.*
27 *Britton*, 357 F.Supp. 825 (D.Kan. 1973), *aff'd*, 503 F.2d 38 (10th Cir. 1974); *Ward v. Werner*, 61 F.R.D.
28

1 639 (M.D.Pa. 1974).

2 (3) Based on the above, the Court should deny plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis*,
3 Plaintiff has not shown that he is unable to pay the full filing fee (\$250.00) to proceed with his lawsuit.

4 (4) Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the
5 parties shall have ten (10) days from service of this Report to file written objections. *See also* Fed.R.Civ.P.
6 6. Failure to file objections will result in a waiver of those objections for purposes of appeal. Thomas v.
7 Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Accommodating the time limit imposed by Rule 72(b), the clerk is directed to
8 set the matter for consideration on **June 24, 2005**, as noted in the caption.

9 DATED this 1st day of June, 2005.

10
11 /s/ J. Kelley Arnold
12 J. Kelley Arnold
13 United States Magistrate Judge
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28